

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated October 5, 2006.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 7, and 15 have been amended, and claim 2 has been canceled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-20 remain pending in the present application.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to include the limitations of claim 2, in order to place the claims in condition for allowance. Claims 3 and 7 have been amended to correct its claim dependency. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 15 is found in original claim 2, on page 6, paragraph 20, and on page 7, paragraph 23. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been presented.

In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicants' amendments and arguments, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendments and arguments to clarify issues upon appeal.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Saeki (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0039730). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiners rejections. The present invention provides a method for dynamically generating database queries when using a web-based GUI. Traditionally, query statements have been implemented manually using HTML code or a design tool, which is very time consuming and impractical. The method of the present invention includes storing query web interface data, including attributes for a database, in one

more tables, and retrieving the attributes from the table and displaying a functionally categorized listing of query attributes on a GUI web page. The method also includes allowing a user to select any combination of attributes on the GUI web page, dynamically generating an SQL query based on the attributes selected by the user, and displaying results of the SQL query to the user in graphical format, thereby enabling dynamic generation of custom queries. Saeki does not teach or even suggest these features, as discussed below.

Claim 1

Saeki does not teach or even suggest dynamically generating database queries “when using a web-based graphical user interface (GUI)” and “allowing a user to select any combination of attributes on the GUI web page,” as recited in independent claim 1. Nowhere does Saeki mention “GUI web pages.” In fact, referring to Figure 1 and paragraph 64 of Saeki, a user constructs queries at a user terminal UT using a data dictionary 16, where the display is controlled “according to a virtual data structure based on the definition information that is described in the data dictionary.” The display of Saeki is different from a web-based GUI or clearly teaches away from allowing a user to select attributes on a “GUI web page” as in the present invention. A benefit of the present invention that it enables a user to dynamically generate custom queries using a GUI web page. Saeki does not provide this benefit since Saeki does not teach or suggest using GUI web pages for generating queries.

Saeki also does not teach or even suggest the combination of “retrieving the attributes from the table and displaying a functionally categorized listing of query attributes on a GUI web page” and “dynamically generating an SQL query based on the

attributes selected by the user,” as recited in independent claim 1. In rejected claim 2, the Examiner referred paragraphs 91-94 as teaching “displaying the attributes as a functionally categorized listing of query attributes.” However, nowhere do these sections mention or suggest a “functionally categorized listing of query attributes.” Paragraphs 91-94 merely describe processing a retrieval request after the request has already been created. Paragraph 91 describes an issuance of a retrieval request. Paragraph 92 mentions a retrieval request translation. Paragraphs 93 and 94 describe retrieval processes. In contrast to Saeki, a “functionally categorized listing of query attributes” is displayed on a graphical user interface web page for user selection, and a SQL query is dynamically generated “based on the attributes selected by the user.”

Furthermore, even where Saeki mentions selecting objects for retrieval, Saeki merely states that the user “first selects a specific display table by using a display table index” and that the user “then selects a display item from the selected display table” (paragraph 87). Nowhere do these sections teach or even suggest that the displayed items are a “functionally categorized listing of query attributes” as in the present invention.

Accordingly, Saeki fails to teach or suggest the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and this claim is allowable over Saeki.

Claim 15

Similar to amended independent claim 1, amended independent claim 15 recites a “display a functionally categorized listing of query attributes on a GUI page on the client computer for user selection of database attributes” and “allowing a user to select any combination of attributes on the GUI web page.” As described above, with respect

to amended independent claim 1, Saeki does not teach or suggest these features. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to amended independent claim 1 apply with equal force to claim 15. Therefore, claim 15 is allowable over Saeki for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Dependent claims 3-14 and 16-20 depend from independent claims 1 and 15, respectively. Accordingly, the above-articulated arguments related to independent claims 1 and 15 apply with equal force to claims 3-14 and 16-20, which are thus allowable over the cited references for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 15.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

December 5, 2006

Respectfully submitted,
Strategic Patent Group, PC

/Stephen G. Sullivan/
Stephen G. Sullivan
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 38,329
(650) 969-7474